JS 44 (Rev. 02/19)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	CRC SHOOL BEE INSTRUCT	ONS ON NEXT PAGE OF TH	DEFENDANTS	3		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) BARSHAY SANDERS, PLLC 100 Garden City Plaza, Ste 500, Garden City, NY 11530 (516) 203-7600			FBCS, INC.			
			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant MONTGOMERY (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)		RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
O I U.S. Government • 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Not a Party)	(Por Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State O			
O 2 U.S. Government Defendant	O 4 Diversity (Indicase Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State O		d Principal Place O 5 O 5 a Another State	
		444	Citizen or Subject of a O Foreign Country	3 O 3 Foreign Nation	0 6 06	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On	(y) (RAIS			lick her for Nature of Surit Code Descriptions OTHER STATUTES	
O 110 Insurance O 120 Marine O 130 Miller Act O 140 Negotiable Instrument O 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment O 151 Medicare Act O 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) O 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits O 160 Stockholders' Suits O 190 Other Contract O 195 Contract Product Liability O 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY O 210 Land Condemnation O 220 Foreclosure O 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment O 240 Torts to Land O 245 Tort Product Liability O 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY O 310 Airplane O 315 Airplane Product Liability O 320 Assault, Libel & Slander O 330 Federal Employers' Liability O 340 Marine O 345 Marine Product Liability O 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability O 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability O 360 Other Personal Injury O 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CINTURIGHTS O 440 Other Civil Rights O 441 Voting O 442 Employment O 443 Housing/ Accommodations O 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment O 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other O 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY O 365 Personal Injury Product Liability O 367 Health Care/ Pharmacoutical Personal Injury Product Liability O 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTO O 370 Other Fraud O 371 Truth in Lending O 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTO O 376 Other Personal Property Damage O 385 Property Damage O 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence O 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence O 530 General O 535 Death Penalty Other: O 540 Mandamus & Other O 550 Civil Rights O 555 Prison Condition O 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinencent	O 625 Drug Related Scizure of Property 21 USC 881 O 690 Other	O 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 O 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY-RIGHTS O 820 Copyrights O 830 Patent O 840 Trademark SCHAE SECUREPY O 861 HIA (1395ff) O 862 Black Lung (923) O 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) O 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS O 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) O 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	O 375 False Claims Act O 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) O 400 State Reapportionment O 410 Antitrust O 430 Banks and Banking O 450 Commerce O 460 Deportation O 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations •480 Consumer Credit O 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act O 490 Cable/Sat TV O 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange O 890 Other Statutory Actions O 891 Agricultural Acts	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in 1 Original O 2 Rems Proceeding Cour	t O3 Ren	e under which you are filing (Reinstated or Reopened O 5 Transferrer Another (specify) Do not cite jurisilictional statutes unit Debt Collection Practices	District Litigation - Transfer		
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER RULE 2:		DEMAND \$	DEMANDS CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: • Yes O No		
IX. RELATED CASE IF ANY		JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	JUN 26 2020	
DATE June 17, 2020		SIGNATURE OF ATTORNE	Y OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT#	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP	RIDGE	MAQ. JUI	DGE	

Case 2:20-cv-03341-CDJ Document 1 Filed 06/26/20 Page 2 of 15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 9152 Delta Place	e Road, New Roads, Louisiana 70760						
Address of Defendant: 330 S. Warmins	ter Road, Hatboro, Pennsylvania 19040						
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	Montgomery County						
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:							
Case Number: Judge:	Date Terminated:						
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the follow	wing questions:						
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?							
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit yes No V							
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?							
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No Ves No Ves							
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.							
DATE: 6/17/20	at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)						
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:						
I. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases Please specify): FDCPA	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):						
ADRITE	RATION CERTIFICATION						
	s to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)						
I,, counsel of record or pr	ro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:						
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:	f my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case:						
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	JUN 26 2020						
	gn here if applicable						
Attorney-a	at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)						
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance w	ith F.R.C.P. 38.						

Civ. 609 (5/2018)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Michael Battiste, individually ar others similarly situated	id on behalf of all	CIVIL ACTION	
V.	•		,
FBCS, Inc and Jefferson Capita	l Systems, Inc :	NO.	
plaintiff shall complete a Case Miling the complaint and serve a side of this form.) In the even designation, that defendant shall	Management Track Design copy on all defendants. (So that a defendant does not that a defendant does not that its first appearances, a Case Management Track.)	Reduction Plan of this court, countation Form in all civil cases at the ee § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the not agree with the plaintiff regardic, submit to the clerk of court and sack Designation Form specifying the	time of reverse ng said erve on
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLI	LOWING CASE MANA	GEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brou	ight under 28 U.S.C. § 22	241 through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security - Cases requand Human Services denying			()
(c) Arbitration - Cases required	to be designated for arbi	tration under Local Civil Rule 53.2	. ()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving exposure to asbestos.	claims for personal injury	or property damage from	()
(e) Special Management – Case commonly referred to as conthe court. (See reverse side management cases.)	mplex and that need speci	al or intense management by	()
(f) Standard Management - Cas	ses that do not fall into an	y one of the other tracks.	(X)
6/17/20 Date	Atterney-at-law	Plantiff Attorney for	
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

BARSHAY SANDERS, PLLC

100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500 Garden City, New York 11530

Tel: (516) 203-7600 Fax: (516) 706-5055 Attorneys for Plaintiff Our File No.: 119206

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA ALLENTOWN DIVISION

Michael Battiste, individually and on behalf of all others' similarly situated,

Case No:

Plaintiff,

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

FBCS, Inc. and Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC,

Defendants.

Michael Battiste, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), by and through the undersigned counsel, complains, states and alleges against FBCS, Inc. and Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Defendants"), as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks to recover for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., ("FDCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

- 3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this Judicial District.
- 4. At all relevant times, Defendants conducted business within the State of Pennsylvania.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff Michael Battiste is an individual who is a citizen of the State of Louisiana residing in Pointe Coupee County, Louisiana.
 - 6. Plaintiff is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt.
 - 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. On information and belief, Defendant FBCS, Inc., is a Pennsylvania with a principal place of business in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.
- 9. On information and belief, Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is an Ohio Limited Liability Company with a principal place of business in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.
- On information and belief, Defendant FBCS, Inc. regularly collects or attempts to collect debts asserted to be owed to others.
- 11. On information and belief, Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems. LLC regularly collects or attempts to collect debts asserted to be owed to others.
- 12. On information and belief, Defendant FBCS, Inc. is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.
- 13. On information and belief, Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.
- 14. On information and belief, the principal purpose of Defendant FBCS, Inc.'s business is the collection of such debts.
- 15. On information and belief, the principal purpose of Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC's business is the collection of such debts.
- On information and belief, Defendant FBCS, Inc. uses the mails in its debt collection business.
- 17. On information and belief, Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC uses the mails in its debt collection business.
 - 18. Defendant FBCS, Inc. is a "debt collector" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

19. Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC is a "debt collector" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO PLAINTIFF

- 20. Defendants allege Plaintiff owes a debt ("the alleged Debt").
- 21. The alleged Debt is an alleged obligation of Plaintiff to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the money, property, insurance, or services which are the subject of the transaction are primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
 - 22. The alleged Debt does not arise from any business enterprise of Plaintiff.
 - 23. The alleged Debt is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 24. At an exact time known only to Defendants, the alleged Debt was assigned or otherwise transferred to Defendants for collection.
- 25. At the time the alleged Debt was assigned or otherwise transferred to Defendants for collection, the alleged Debt was in default.
- 26. In their efforts to collect the debt, Defendants contacted Plaintiff by letter ("the Letter") dated February 3, 2020. ("Exhibit 1.")
 - 27. The Letter conveyed information regarding the alleged Debt.
 - 28. The Letter is a "communication" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).
 - 29. The Letter was received and read by Plaintiff.
- 30. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e protects Plaintiff's concrete interests. Plaintiff has the interest and right to be free from deceptive and/or misleading communications from Defendants. As set forth herein, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of this right.
 - 31. The deprivation of Plaintiff's rights will be redressed by a favorable decision herein.

FIRST COUNT Violations of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10)

- 32. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully restated herein.
- 33. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e provides, generally, that a debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.

- 34. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a false representation made in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 35. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a deceptive representation made in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 36. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a misleading representation made in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 37. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A) prohibits the false representation of the character, amount, or legal status of any debt.
- 38. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a false representation of the character of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 39. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a false representation of the amount of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 40. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a false representation of the legal status of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 41. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) prohibits the use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.
- 42. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a false representation made in an attempt to collect the debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 43. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt, when the debt is not owed at all by the consumer, is a deceptive means used in an attempt to collect the debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
 - 44. The Letter alleges that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90.
 - 45. Plaintiff did not owe \$11,560.90.
 - 46. Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants

were seeking to collect.

- 47. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a false representation made by Defendants in connection with Defendants' collection of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 48. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a deceptive representation made by Defendants in connection with Defendants' collection of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 49. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a misleading representation made by Defendants in connection with Defendants' collection of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 50. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a false representation of the character of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 51. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a false representation of the amount of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 52. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a false representation of the legal status of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 53. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a false representation made in an attempt to collect the alleged Debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 54. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed \$11,560.90, when Plaintiff did not owe any money at all to the entity on whose behalf Defendants were seeking to collect, is a deceptive means used in an attempt to collect the alleged Debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 55. For the foregoing reasons, Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10) and are liable to Plaintiff therefor.

SECOND COUNT Violations of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10)

- 56. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully restated herein.
- 57. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e provides, generally, that a debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
- 58. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a false representation made in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 59. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a deceptive representation made in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 60. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a misleading representation made in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 61. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A) prohibits the false representation of the character, amount, or legal status of any debt.
- 62. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a false representation of the character of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 63. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a false representation of the amount of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 64. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a false representation of the legal status of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 65. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) prohibits the use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.
- 66. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a false representation made in an attempt to collect the debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).

- 67. An allegation by a debt collector that a consumer owes a debt to a certain entity, when the debt is not owed by the consumer to that entity, is a deceptive means used in an attempt to collect the debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
 - 68. The Letter claims that Plaintiff owes a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC.
 - 69. Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC.
 - 70. Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC never offered to extend credit to Plaintiff.
 - 71. Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC never extended credit to Plaintiff.
- 72. Plaintiff was never involved in any transaction with Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC.
 - 73. Plaintiff never entered into any contract with Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC.
 - 74. Plaintiff never did any business with Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC.
 - 75. Plaintiff was never indebted to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC.
 - 76. Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC is a stranger to Plaintiff.
- 77. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a false representation made by Defendants in connection with Defendants' collection of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 78. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a deceptive representation made by Defendants in connection with Defendants' collection of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 79. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a misleading representation made by Defendants in connection with Defendants' collection of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 80. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a false representation of the character of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 81. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a false representation of the amount of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).

- 82. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a false representation of the legal status of the alleged Debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A).
- 83. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a false representation made in an attempt to collect the alleged Debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 84. Defendants' allegation that Plaintiff owed a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, when Plaintiff did not owe a debt to Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC, is a deceptive means used in an attempt to collect the alleged Debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 85. Defendants' demand that Plaintiff make payment for a debt that he does not owe is a false representation made to attempt to collect any debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 86. Defendants' request that Plaintiff make payment for a debt that he does not owe is a deceptive means used to attempt to collect any debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).
- 87. For the foregoing reasons, Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10) and are liable to Plaintiff therefor.

THIRD COUNT Violations of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e and 1692e(10)

- 88. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully restated herein.
- 89. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e prohibits a debt collector from using any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
- 90. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) prohibits the use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.
- 91. A debt collection practice can be a "false, deceptive, or misleading" practice in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e even if it does not fall within any of the subsections of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 92. A collection letter violates 15 U.S.C. § 1692e if, in the eyes of the least sophisticated consumer, it is open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate.
- 93. A collection letter also violates 15 U.S.C. § 1692e if, it is reasonably susceptible to an inaccurate reading by the least sophisticated consumer. *DeSantis*, 269 F.3d at 161.
 - 94. The Letter contains a settlement offer.

- 95. While a settlement offer in and of itself is not improper, such offer runs afoul of the FDCPA if it impresses upon the least sophisticated consumer that if he or she does not accept the settlement, he or she will have no further opportunity to settle the alleged Debt for less than the full amount.
- 96. These concerns can be adequately addressed by the debt collector including with the offer the following language: "We are not obligated to renew this offer."
- 97. The phrase "we are not obligated to renew this offer" adequately conveys to the least sophisticated consumer that there is a renewal possibility, but also that it is not assured.
- 98. The Letter does not state "we are not obligated to renew this offer," nor does it include any kind of substantially similar language.
 - 99. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be misled by the settlement offer.
- 100. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be misled in a material way by the settlement offer.
- 101. For the foregoing reasons, Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e and 1692e(10) and are liable to Plaintiff therefor.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 102. Plaintiff brings this action individually and as a class action on behalf of all persons similarly situated in the State of Pennsylvania.
 - 103. Plaintiff seeks to certify two classes of:
 - i. All consumers to whom Defendants sent a collection letter attempting to collect an alleged Debt that was in fact not actually owed in that amount or to the entity on behalf of whom Defendants were trying to collect such debt, substantially and materially similar to the Letter sent to Plaintiff, which letter was sent on or after a date one year prior to the filing of this action to the present.
 - ii. All consumers to whom Defendants sent a collection letter containing a settlement offer without any statement such as "we are not obligated to renew this offer," or any substantially similar language, substantially and materially similar to the Letter sent to Plaintiff, which letter was sent on or after a date one year prior to the filing of this action to the present
 - 104. This action seeks a finding that Defendants' conduct violates the FDCPA, and asks

that the Court award damages as authorized by 15 U.S.C. § 1692k.

- 105. The Class consists of more than thirty-five persons.
- 106. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class. Common questions of law or fact raised by this action affect all members of the Class and predominate over any individual issues. Common relief is therefore sought on behalf of all members of the Class. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.
- 107. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to the individual members of the Class, and a risk that any adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class would, as a practical matter, either be dispositive of the interests of other members of the Class not party to the adjudication, or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests. Defendants have acted in a manner applicable to the Class as a whole such that declaratory relief is warranted.
- 108. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect and represent the interests of the Class. The management of the class is not extraordinarily difficult, and the factual and legal issues raised by this action will not require extended contact with the members of the Class, because Defendants' conduct was perpetrated on all members of the Class and will be established by common proof. Moreover, Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in actions brought under consumer protection laws.

JURY DEMAND

109. Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of this action by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment be entered:

- a. Certify this action as a class action; and
- b. Appoint Plaintiff as Class Representative of the Class, and Plaintiff's attorneys as Class Counsel; and
- c. Find that Defendants' actions violate the FDCPA; and
- d. Grant damages against Defendants pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and
- e. Grant Plaintiff's attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and

- Grant Plaintiff's costs; together with
- Such other relief that the Court determines is just and proper.

DATED: April 9, 2020

NDERS, PLLC

Melissa Pirillo, Esq. 100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500

Garden City, New York 11530

Tel: (516) 203-7600 Fax: (516) 706-5055

Mpirillo@barshaysanders.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Our File No.: 119206

